

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00472 310429Z

14

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ACDA-19 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 008982

R 301730Z JAN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3790

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 472

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OF VERIFICATION PAPER
VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: (A) USNATO 236; (B) STATE 17635; (C) USNATO 241

SUMMARY: SPC JANUARY 28 REVIEWED THIRD REVISION OF
ITS DRAFT REPORT ON VERIFICATION (TEXT OF REF A),
WITH ALLIES SPEAKING FROM INSTRUCTIONS THROUGHOUT.
US REP DREW FULLY ON GUIDANCE IN REF B. ALLIES
MAINTAINED PREVIOUS POSITION AT LEAST FOR TIME
BEING. UK PROPOSED FURTHER ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE
FAVORING EFFORT TO NEGOTIATE MOBILE TEAMS IN ADDITION
TO STATIC POSTS. RESULT IS THAT ALL BUT ONE OF PRE-
VIOUSLY REPORTED BRACKETS REMAIN, NEW US LANGUAGE FOR
PARA 5 IS IN A NEW BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE, AND UK REVISIONS
ARE INCLUDED, MOSTLY AS FURTHER BRACKETS IN PARAS 25, 27
AND 30. SPC WILL DECIDE FEBRUARY 1 WHEN TO SCHEDULE NEXT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00472 310429Z

MEETING ON VERIFICATION. TEXT OF NEW REVISIONS AND MISSION
COMMENTS SEPTELS. BELOW IS CURRENT STATE-OF-PLAY ON
OUTSTANDING ISSUES. END SUMMARY.

1. NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS (PARA 5) - US REP PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE FOR SECOND SENTENCE PER PARA 2 REF C. FRG REP (RANTZAU) EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR US EFFORT WHICH HE SAID BONN WILL WISH TO STUDY. ON PERSONAL BASIS, HE BELIEVED NEW FORMULATION MIGHT NOT GO FAR ENOUGH TO MEET FRG'S FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS. SOLUTION MIGHT HINGE ON TERM "ALLIES WILL BE INTERESTED IN SHARING..." FOR FRG QUESTION WAS NOT SIMPLY ONE OF "INTEREST," BUT OF "ABSOLUTE POLITICAL NECESSITY" THAT IT PARTICIPATE IN ANALYSIS OF NTM OUTPUT. UK REP (LOGAN) WELCOMED NEW US FORMULATION AND HOPED ALLIES WOULD RALLY TO IT. AT FRG REQUEST, BRACKETS REMAIN AROUND OLD SECOND SENTENCE, WITH NEW US LANGUAGE GOING INTO BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE.

2. MEASURES OUTSIDE THE NGA (PARA 9) - TURKISH REP (TULUMEN) STATED THAT ALTHOUGH HE HAD RECOMMENDED FLEXIBILITY TO ANKARA ON CURRENT LANGUAGE, HE WAS UNDER INSTRUCTIONS TO RETAIN PARAGRAPH 9 AS IS. FRG, BELGIAN AND DUTCH REPS AGREED THOUGHT SHOULD REMAIN BUT THEY WERE NOT WEDDED TO ANY SPECIFIC LANGUAGE. US REP DREW FULLY ON ARGUMENTS CONTAINED PARA 2, REF B, CONCLUDING THAT WASHINGTON OPPOSED ANY VERIFICATION SYSTEM WHICH WOULD APPLY SPECIFICALLY TO STABILIZING MEASURES. PARA 9 THEREFORE REMAINS IN BRACKETS.

3. LIAISON OFFICERS (PARA 10) - FRG REP SAID BONN MAINTAINED ITS POSITION ON LIAISON OFFICERS (LOS). THEREFORE LAST PART OF PARA 10 SHOULD REMAIN. TAKING STRONGER SUPPORTING LINE THAN AT LAST MEETING, UK REP MAINTAINED LOS WOULD PROTECT NATO'S INTERESTS RATHER THAN HINDER ALLIED TEAMS ON WP SIDE OF NGA. WP TEAMS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO "WANDER AROUND" NGA WITHOUT THE ALLIES KNOWING WHAT THEY ARE DOING. IF THERE WERE NO LOS, ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO TRACK WP TEAMS COVERTLY. SUCH SURVEILLANCE WOULD NOT RULE OUT POSSIBLE CONFRONTATIONS AND INCIDENTS BETWEEN TEAMS AND ALLIED FORCES (FOR EXAMPLE ON MANEUVER) WHICH TEAMS WOULD PRESUMABLY TRY TO LOCATE. PACT WOULD INVARIABLY
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00472 310429Z

TRAIL ALLIED TEAMS. WITH A WP LO PRESENT, TEAMS COULD QUICKLY UNSCRAMBLE DIFFICULTIES IN ENCOUNTER, WITH "LOWER LEVEL OFFICIALDOM." ABSENCE OF LOS COULD FACILITATE DELIBERATE WP CREATION OF TIME-CONSUMING DIFFICULTIES AND OBSTACLES FOR TEAMS WHICH COULD DETRACT FROM THEIR MISSIONS.

4. US REP PUT FORTH WASHINGTON'S OPPOSITON TO LOS PER PARAS 4 AND 5, REF B. DUTCH REP (BUWALDA) SUGGESTED CAPITALS REFLECT FUTTHER ON ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF LOS, GIVEN FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT VIEWS. BRACKETS REMAIN AROUND LAST PART OF PARA 10.

5. VERIFICATION OF STABILIZING MEASURES (PARA 19) -

SUPPLEMENTING EARLIER STATEMENT ON PARA 9, US REP SAID WASHINGTON BELIEVED THAT MOBILE TEAMS WOULD ALSO BE HIGHLY LIKELY TO DETECT MANY VIOLATIONS OF ANY AGREEMENT ON STABILIZING MEASURES. THIS SHOULD AVOID THE NEED TO SEEK FORMAL AGREEMENT TO VERIFY STABILIZING MEASURES AND THUS FURTHER ENCUMBER AN ALREADY DIFFICULT NEGOTIATING PROGRAM. DUTCH REP DISAGREED; SEVERAL ALLIES WANTED THE SPECIFICALLY AGREED RIGHT TO VERIFY STABILIZING MEASURES. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) CONCURRED. LAST SENTENCE IN PARA 19, THEREFORE, REMAINS BRACKETED.

6. SPECIFIC MEASURES - UK THINKING ON PARA 22 ITSELF, AS WELL AS PARAS 23, 25, 27 AND 30, WAS THAT FROM A MILITARY STANDPOINT:

A) COMBINATION OF MOBILE TEAMS AND STATIC POSTS WOULD PROVIDE THE BEST OVERT INSPECTION SYSTEM, IF IT CAN BE ACHIEVED IN NEGOTIATIONS.

B) REDUCED NUMBER OF MOBILE TEAMS WITH SOME STATIC POSTS WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO A LARGER NUMBER OF MOBILE TEAMS OR STATIC POSTS TAKEN ALONE.

C) A SECOND BEST CHOICE IS MOBILE TEAMS ALONE, WHICH IN GENERAL ARE SUPERIOR TO STATIC POSTS.

D) STATIC POSTS ARE A POOR AND EXPENSIVE THIRD OPTION FOR MONITORING REDUCTIONS, AND ARE OF LITTLE VALUE FOR POST-REDUCTION VERIFICATION.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 00472 310429Z

IN NEGOTIATIONS, UK BELIEVED ALLIES SHOULD PUSH FOR MOBILE TEAM/STATIC POST COMBINATION FIRST, AND AS SEQUENTIAL FALLBACKS ACCEPT MOBILE TEAMS AND AS A LAST RESORT STATIC POSTS. UK SAW NO REASON FOR ALLIES TO PRESENT FIRST FALLBACK POSITION AT THE OUTSET.

7. US REP SAID ALLIES SHOULD SEEK MOBILE TEAMS ALONE AND NOT ALLOW SOVIETS THE OPPORTUNITY OF AGREEING TO STATIC POSTS, WHICH THEY COULD DO IF ALLIES PUT FORWARD BOTH PROPOSALS AT THE SAME TIME. SINCE ALL ALLIES AGREED MOBILE TEAMS WERE SUPERIOR TO STATIC POSTS, US REP THOUGHT PROBLEM WAS ONE OF DIFFERREING NEGOTIATING APPROACHES. CANADIAN AND FRG REPS INCLINED TO UK'S APPROACH, SO LAST SENTENCE IN PARA 22 WILL BE DELETED AS INCONSISTENT WITH FIRST SENTENCE OF SAME PARA. LAST SENTENCE WILL BE REPLACED BY ONE PROPOSED BY MC REP WHICH REFLECTS UK POINTS A) THROUGH C) NOTED ABOVE.

BRACKETED ALTERNATIVES REFLECTING BRITISH VIEWS WILL ALSO APPEAR IN PARAS 25, 27 AND 30. FRG REP ALSO INTRODUCED LANGUAGE CHANGES TO ITS SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE TO PARA 30 G UK REQUESTED INCLUSION OF SOME OTHER COMMENTS IN PARAS 27, 33 AND 38.

8. FRG REP PROPOSED TO DELETE PARA 28, SINCE BONN BELIEVED THAT QUESTION OF WHETHER MEASURES CREATED A "SPECIAL ZONE" WAS NOT GERMANE TO PRESENT PAPER AND ITS RETENTION COULD CREATE FUTURE PROBLEMS. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) SAID PARAGRAPH SHOULD REMAIN SINCE IT CONCERNED A KEY ISSUE. FRG AGREED NOT TO BRACKET, BUT RESERVED THE RIGHT TO COME BACK TO POINT.

9. WE WILL TRANSMIT TEXT OF ACTUAL LANGUAGE CHANGES WHEN IS CIRCULATES THEM. MISSION SUGGESTIONS TO MOVE PROJECT ALONG SEPTTEL. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 JAN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO00472
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740173/abbrysxk.tel
Line Count: 176
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 236; (B) STATE 17635; (C) USNATO 241
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 12 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <23-Jul-2001 by maustmc, RDRFD>; RELEASED <12 APR 2002 by garlanwa>; APPROVED <12 APR 2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OF VERIFICATION PAPER VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005